

MEMO FROM
J. LEDERBERG
GENETICS DEPARTMENT
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

TO:
Pete Day
ACDA

TX
RC
RO

On Soviet innocence

AUG 17 1970

I did not read this as at all funny. The significance of the remark was illuminated for me by Roshchin's anti-expert remarks at the CCD.

But if they fail to understand the nuances of our calculus of deterrence (and their sluggishness in accepting the aggressive implications of ABM (for population defense) may substantiate that mis-communication), then

we are banking a great deal on instruments and not enough on explaining them. Reaching their scientists via Pugwash makes sense; but you commented yourself that experts might be non-persons, and this may also apply to their own.

What I conclude and recommend is that our own political leaders make sure to voice our strategic policies with atypical detail and clarity, directly, and through diplomatic forums like the UN, if we want to be sure of getting through. Their "innocence of the calculus" makes it less likely that a ~~XXXXXX~~ deterrent will work, as intended, without being used; and needless to say interferes with rational dampening of the arms spiral. Or am I being innocent?

Tom Schelling's most interesting remarks in "Strategy of Conflict" concerned the struggle for non-communication. It would be cheaper to work on that than to have to multiply our arsenal-in-being.

